

#### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Although Applicant disagrees with the Office interpretation of the Eriksson reference, claims 1 and 2 have been amended to make even more apparent the fact that Eriksson does not teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention.

The outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Eriksson refers to upper part 12 and lower part 16. The so-called lower part 16 is a spring mounted on the so-called upper part 12. The only movement that occurs between these parts is the bending movement of the ends of the spring 16 shown in Figs. 7 and 8 of Eriksson.

Claim 1 now recites that the blocking arrangement comprises the bending devices (21,22) which, in the initial position, are in blocking contact with a rigid surface on the lower part (5), spaced from the upper part (6), preventing the upper part from being moved in the direction of the lower part. This arrangement is clearly shown in Figs. 5 and 6 of Applicant's drawings, for example, in which, in the initial position, the bending devices (21,22) are in blocking contact with a rigid surface (46) on the lower part, spaced from the upper part, preventing the upper part from being moved in the direction of the lower part.

Nothing of the sort is disclosed in Eriksson, wherein the portions of the spring 16 (referred to as the lower part) engaged by the bending devices (4) are necessarily flexible and resilient. These portions could not be made rigid, because to do so would render the Eriksson device inoperative. Eriksson requires that these portions of the spring 16 bend so that the bending devices 4 can move as shown in Figs. 7 and 8.

Moreover, the bending portions of the spring 16 are not spaced from the so-called upper part 12, as now recited in claim 1.

Claim 2 now recites that the respective second contact points (49,50) are on the rigid surface, as shown in Fig. 6 of Applicant's drawings, for example.

From the foregoing discussion of Eriksson, it is apparent that the invention recited in Applicant's claims has a construction that is quite different from Eriksson's and operates in a manner quite different from Eriksson's.

Accordingly, all of the claims should now be allowed.

This application is believed to be clearly in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1165 (XA-10592) any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any

extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this paper and has not been separately requested, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Nelson H. Shapiro  
Nelson H. Shapiro  
Reg. No. 17,095

Miles & Stockbridge, P.C.  
1751 Pinnacle Drive  
Suite 500  
McLean, Virginia 22102-3833  
(703) 903-9000

October 23, 2008  
NHS:jar